1 2 3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON 4 AT TACOMA 5 6 ANTHONY J. ABUAN, CASE NO. C12-5069 BHS Plaintiff, 7 ORDER GRANTING 8 v. **DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO** REMAND CITY OF FIFE, et al., 9 Defendants. 10 11 This matter comes before the Court on Defendant Washington State Department 12 of Licensing and its unnamed officers and agents' ("DOL") motion to remand (Dkt. 14). 13 The Court has considered the pleadings filed in support of and in opposition to the 14 motion and the remainder of the file and hereby grants the motion for the reasons stated 15 herein. 16 I. PROCEDURAL HISTORY 17 On December 29, 2011, Plaintiff Anthony Abuan ("Abuan") filed a complaint in 18 the Pierce County Superior Court for the State of Washington against the City of Fife, the 19 DOL, and various unnamed officers and agents of those entities. Dkt. 1 at 7–14. On 20 January 26, 2012, the City of Fife removed the matter to this Court. *Id.* Abuan properly 21 served the DOL on February 6, 2012. Dkt. 14 at 3. 22

1 On August 8, 2012, the DOL filed a motion to remand. Dkt. 14. On September 9, 2 2012, Abuan responded. Dkt. 16. The DOL did not reply. 3 II. DISCUSSION 4 The DOL moves for remand based on the state's Eleventh Amendment immunity 5 to suits in federal court. Abuan counters that the DOL's appearance, answer, and minor participation in the suit shows that the DOL has waived its immunity and has submitted 6 to the jurisdiction of this Court. Dkt. 16 at 4–5. Abuan fails to cite any authority for the 8 Court to conclude that such limited participation is a waiver of immunity. In fact, 9 contrary to Abuan's position, the test for waiver of such immunity is stringent and requires an "unequivocal indication' that [the state] consents to suit in federal court." 10 11 Micomonaco v. State of Wash., 45 F.3d 316, 321 (9th Cir. 1995) (quoting Charley's Taxi 12 Radio Dispatch Corp. v. SIDA of Hawaii, Inc., 810 F.2d 869, 873 (9th Cir. 1987)). The 13 Court finds that the DOL has not waived its immunity. Therefore, the Court grants the 14 DOL's motion to remand. 15 III. ORDER 16 Therefore, it is hereby **ORDERED** that DOL's motion to remand (Dkt. 14) is 17 **GRANTED** and Abuan's claims against the DOL shall be **REMANDED**. 18 Dated this 20th day of September, 2012. 19 20 21 United States District Judge 22